R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 018 156 FL 000 579

THE JOINT EUROPEAN-UNITED STATES NDEA INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY, MANNHEIM-HEIDELBERG.

BY- VAN TESLAAR, A.P.
CONSORTIUM OF PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

PUB DATE 67

CONTRACT OEC-2-6-001005-1005
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.08 25P.

DESCRIPTORS- *CONTRASTIVE LINGUISTICS, *PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS, *INSTITUTES (TRAINING PROGRAMS), *LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION, *PROGRAM EVALUATION, ENGLISH (SECOND LANGUAGE), INTERCULTURAL PROGRAMS, TEACHER IMPROVEMENT, APPLIED LINGUISTICS, COMPARATIVE EDUCATION, EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAMS, GERMAN, LANGUAGE TEACHERS, CULTURAL CONTENT, PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION, NDEA TITLE 11, CONPASS, GERMANY,

THE EUROPEAN COORDINATOR AND RESIDENT CO-DIRECTOR OF THE MANNHEIM-HEIDELBERG BRANCH OF THE SUMMER 1966 LANGUAGE INSTITUTE IN FRANCE AND GERMANY PREPARED THIS EVALUATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL VENTURE. DESIGNED TO ANALYZE THE INNOVATIONAL ASPECTS OF THE 1966 INSTITUTE WITH THE IDEA OF STRENGTHENING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THIS AND SIMILAR PROGRAMS, THE COMMENTARY (1) EXAMINES, FROM THE EUROPEAN POINT OF VIEW, THE PREPARATION AND CONDUCT OF THE INSTITUTE, (2) EMPHASIZES SPECIFIC PROBLEMS AND ADVANTAGES ASSOCIATED WITH EUROPEAN PARTICIPATION, AND (3) EVALUATES THE PRESENT AND POTENTIAL ROLE OF SUCH INSTITUTES IN EUROPEAN EDUCATION. THE REPORT DESCRIBES THE GENESIS OF THE IDEA, THE PREPARATION OF THE PROJECT, AND THE STRUCTURE AND ORGANIZATION OF THE INSTITUTE. THE FEATURES OF THE INSTITUTE ARE EVALUATED, WITH SPECIAL ATTENTION PAID TO ITS FUNCTION AND DURATION, THE AGE OF REFERENCE GROUPS, RECOMMENDED EMPHASES, AND SUPPLEMENTARY ACTIVITIES. CONCLUDING REMARKS PERTAIN TO THE VALUE, EXTENSIONS, AND POTENTIAL OF JOINT INSTITUTES. (AB)

ED018156

THE JOINT EUROPEAN — UNITED STATES NDEA INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY

Mannheim — Heidelberg

By

A. P. van Teslaar

1967

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FL 000 714

FOREWARD

This report is one of a series presenting the results of studies of NDEA Title XI and Arts and Humanities Foundation institute programs and selected institute-associated activities conducted in 1966 by the Consortium of Professional Associations for the Study of Special Teacher Improvement Programs (CONPASS) for the U.S. Office of Education under Contract No. OEC2-6-001005-1005 and four subcontracts.

The Consortium was formed in May 1966 by the five associations which assessed the 1965 Title XI institute program – the American Historical Association, the Association of American Geographers, the Department of Audiovisual Instruction (NEA), the International Reading Association, and the Modern Language Association of America. Invitations to membership were subsequently extended to, and accepted by, the American Economic Association, the American Industrial Arts Association, and the American Political Science Association. Four members at large provide liaison with the arts and humanities, psychological tests and measurement, educational psychology, and teacher education specialists.

The objectives of CONPASS are to: provide a coordinated assessment of the effectiveness and impacts of institutes and other types of special teacher training programs; propose means of improving such programs; and provide a medium for dialogue among the professional associations and leading scholars of the several subject content disciplines and fields represented on its Board. These reports constitute a portion of the program developed to fulfill those objectives. It is hoped that they will prove useful to educators in general as well as to directors and prospective directors of institutes, officers of the U.S. Office of Education, and legislators and administrative officials of the Federal and States' Governments in their joint efforts to improve the quality of American education at all levels.

We take this opportunity to thank the consultants who conducted the studies and authored these reports for their diligent and conscientious performance of complex and exacting assignments.

Kenneth W. Mildenberger, Chairman William H. Wake, Director

EDITORIAL NOTE

During the summer of 1966 one of the most ambitious and imaginative projects in the eight-year history of the modern foreign language institute program of the U.S. Office of Education took place in France and Germany. The American creator and director of this incredibly complex project, Professor Wilmarth H. Starr of New York University, has given a full description of this "adventure in international partnership" in The Joint European-United States NDEA Institutes for Advanced Study, Boulogne-sur-Mer and Mannheim-Heidelberg.

The project is to be repeated in the summer of 1967.

In view of the many innovative aspects of this international undertaking, it appeared desirable that a European be invited to prepare a frank commentary with a view to strengthening future effectiveness of this and similar international ventures. This study was commissioned by the Modern Language Association as one of a series of NDEA institute assessments under the supervision of the Consortium of Professional Associations for the Study of Special Teacher Improvement Programs (CONPASS).

A. P. van Teslaar agreed to prepare this study. He was one of a small group of restless visionaries who met in the restaurant of the Kongresshalle in Berlin one afternoon in September 1964 to study the possibilities of such a joint U.S.-European venture, and he became the European Coordinator and Resident Co-Director of the Mannheim-Heidelberg Institute. Mr. van Teslaar is Director of the Education Office, Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe (SHAPE), Co-Director of the Sprachybernetiches Forchungzentrum in Heidelberg, and Editor of the International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching.

Kenneth W. Mildenberger
Director of Programs
Modern Language Association of America

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction 1

II. Narrative Report 1
1. Genesis of the Idea 1
2. Preparation of the Project 2
3. Structure and Organization of the Institute 4
a. Guidelines 4
b. Physical Facilities 5
c. The Program 6
1) Linguistic Theory 6
2) Contrastive Phonology 7
3) Psychology of Language Learning 8
4) Language-teaching Methodology 8
5) Contrastive Cultural Analysis 9
6) Supporting Activities 11

III. Evaluation 11
1. Function of the Institute 12
2. Duration of the Institute 13
3. Age of Reference Groups 14
4. Recommended Emphases 14
5. Supplementary Activities 16

IV. Concluding Remarks 17
1. Value of the Joint Institute 17
2. Extension to Other National Pairings 18
3. Extension to the United States 18
4. Eventual Role of FIPLV 18
5. Extension to Other Disciplines 19

APPENDIX
Administration & Staff Roster

I. Introduction.

This report proposes to analyze the innovational program that during the summer of 1966 brought teachers of diverse nationalities together, first at Mannheim, then at Heidelberg, for intensive advanced training in disciplines relevant to the conduct of modern foreign language instruction. The point of view adopted is that of the European participant and sponsor. It is proposed to examine the preparation and conduct of the Institute so as to bring into prominence the specific problems and advantages associated with European participation and to evaluate the present and potential role of such an Institute on the European educational scene.

In examining the problems, I shall focus upon those that were significant, bound up, so to speak, with the very nature of an international Institute, and likely to persist or re-emerge in the future. Incidental difficulties of a transitory, "non-organic" nature will be touched on glancingly, if at all, and essentially for their admonitory value; though knowledge of them would be useful in establishing the balance of profit and loss for the 1966 Institute, it would contribute little to a judgment of the suitability of renewing such institutes and indeed making them a permanent feature of the international education scene.

The reader of this report must also bear in mind that it concerns only one of two similarly conceived Institutes, the other one having been held at Boulogne-sur-Mer, France. There is no doubt that each Institute encountered its own problems and rapidly assumed its own spirit and shape, in function of the personalities involved and the different cultural and administrative traditions in play. For example, the administrative problems attendant upon organizing the German Institute arose from the high degree of regional autonomy in matters educational. The equivalent problems for the French Institute were those occasioned by highly centralized control of education. It would obviously be perilous to draw conclusions from one Institute about the other, and equally so to draw conclusions from these two about some hypothetical future one to be established, say, in Spain or Italy.

Yet close attention to the problems of the German Institute is not wholly without paradigmatic value. On the contrary, one encountered there attitudes and conceptions that seem to have had their counterpart at the French Institute and that constitute some of the major factors that must be taken into consideration and allowed for in any joint trans-Atlantic undertakings.

II. Narrative Report.

1. Genesis of the Idea. The idea of a multi-national Institute was first launched in the course of informal discussions at a Congress on Modern Language Instruction held at Berlin in the summer of 1964. A number of officials and experts from various national and international agencies participated in these discussions; because they saw virtue in the basic idea even before the details had been spelled out, and agreed to collaborate on its realization, the transition from vague idea to viable project was relatively quick and painless.

The idea itself was simple enough. The National Defense Education Act called into being in the United States the so-called NDEA Language Institutes, intensive summer training sessions for teachers, designed to improve their grasp of the language they taught and to familiarize them with the new approaches -- psycholinguistic, audio-lingual and -visual, communication-oriented -- that characterize the best of contemporary language instruction.

The first NDEA Institutes were set up in the United States, but an overseas variety thereupon came into existence, intended for teachers whose foreign language proficiency was already such as to enable them to profit fully from a sojourn in the target-language country. These overseas Institutes were purely national in composition. A group of American teachers were transported overseas to follow a program presented,

to be sure, by a staff of mixed nationality but oriented toward purely American needs and geared to purely American attitudes and expectations. The teacher was certainly exposed, and exposed profitably, to the target-language culture, both in formal fashion by way of the work in the Institute and informally through boarding with families, through outings and through social contacts.

Yet one might reasonably ask whether a still larger measure of intermingling, of direct, individual and sustained confrontation with the "others," with the target-language culture, might not be salutary, at least for teachers already in possession of a high degree of linguistic competence and purely professional know-how. The very fact of undergoing exposure to a foreign culture as a member of a mono-national group tends to erect a sort of intangible screen between the observer and the scene observed. The screen is transparent--the observer perfectly sees what is going on around him--but its impact is blurred. It's the difference between looking out on the street --out there--through the windows of one's cozy home and getting out on the street one's self. Whenever the fact of alienness seems to be inflicting itself too insistently on the individual, he can take refuge in the comforting bosom of his group.

In more or less conscious defense against all that is alien and upsetting in the presence of a different culture, the group closes its ranks, serre les coudes; and in this way the individual escapes an all too direct experiential confrontation with the alien culture. He sees and comments on the alienness to his fellow nationals, but as a spectator in the audience, not as an actor on the stage. The full virtue of association with foreigners is realized only to the extent that the individual interacts as fully as possible with them, in as varied contexts as possible. The sense of full personal involvement is necessary.

For this reason, a joint international language teaching Institute in Europe (and eventually why not in the United States as well?) appeared to the discussants at the Berlin conference to be the logical next step beyond the purely national institute, in that the active day-long cohabitation and association of persons with similar professional interests but different national backgrounds would contribute powerfully to that acculturation and that prise de conscience, that existential awareness of otherness, which it is the language teacher's peculiar task to mediate.

Though at first blush this line of reasoning, insofar as an Institute in Germany, for example, was concerned, would seem to apply to the Americans and eventually to the other non-Germans who might participate rather than to the Germans, it had its validity for them as well. To be sure, a stay at Mannheim or Heidelberg could scarcely be considered so acculturating an experience for them as similar time spent, say, at New York. Yet weeks spent in close collaboration with Americans on a program expressly designed to explore and sharpen the awareness of linguistic contrasts and sociocultural differences could certainly have a similar, if less drastic--or traumatic?--acculturating effect on them.

This, then, was the essential idea: to bring together for an extended learning period well-qualified German teachers of English and English-speaking teachers of German, in other words, persons with closely parallel professional interests and complementarily opposed national-cultural backgrounds.

The similarity of professional concerns would provide the mortar to bind the participating national groups together, while their contrasting linguistic and cultural differences would provide the stuff out of which the Institute would be built.

2. Preparation of the Project. In the course of the eighteen months of negotiation and preparation that followed the initiating discussions, this basic idea was never lost sight of, even though the original plan underwent considerable modification in the course of planning and execution. The most significant change occurred at the request of the Council of Europe, the official European sponsor of the project: instead of a purely bi-national Institute, the attempt was made to constitute a multi-national one, with the inclusion of a third, Scandinavian group conversant in both German and English.

We will see later in this report what degree of success this innovation had, but first let us identify the agencies and individuals involved as planners and sponsors of the German Institute. Such a listing may serve to give some idea of the amount of coordination that is necessary for the realization of a joint project.

On the American side, the basic support came from the U. S. Office of Education, acting through the agency of New York University. Professor Wilmarth Starr, All-University Chairman of the Department of Romance Languages of that university, from the start played a role, probably the most dynamic and decisive one, in the creation of the Institute. It was he who conducted the feasibility study that preceded the decision of the USOE to go ahead with what amounted to a radically new departure in the established pattern of NDEA foreign language institutes. And--if a sincere tribute can find a place here in this report--more than anything else it was the splendor of his vision and at times the sheer force of his character and will that kept the project alive and advancing in the face of the discouraging organizational difficulties that more than once put eventual success seriously in question.

On the European side, the over-all sponsorship of the German Institute and of the parallel French one was exercised by the Council of Europe, more specifically by the Council's Committee for Cultural Cooperation. Mr. Sven Nord, the Council's specialist for foreign language pedagogy, represented the Council in discussions and negotiations. The Council all the more willingly accepted the role of patron in that the joint-institute project answered to a two-fold officially expressed interest of the Council: in closer trans-Atlantic cooperation in the cultural sphere and in the improvement of modern language instruction among the seventeen European member nations of the Council. The influence of the Council was particularly sensible in the early phases of the project. The original plan had called for a bi-national seminar. The Council, true to its vocation, favored a more variegated European representation. It was agreed, however, that there were limits to the number of nationalities that could profitably participate during the first year or so of the program. Though one could hope that in time the Institute might be expanded or at least diversified through the participation of teachers from every part of Europe, the problems one could anticipate in setting up a satisfactory *modus vivendi* and *operandi* for Joint Institutes were such that in the early stages one were best advised to fix close limits to the national groups and mother tongues represented. Finally a triadic organization was settled upon: the Joint Institute would be composed of equal numbers of German teachers of English, American teachers of German, and Scandinavian teachers at home in both languages.

The Council played a major role at several critical points, notably in enlisting the support of the Scandinavian and German Federal authorities. And though it was not in a position to carry any major share of the expenses, it did offer the material encouragement of a token grant for the operation of the Institute.

The Fédération Internationale des Professeurs de Langues Vivantes (FIPLV) also played a role, a small but promising one: the International Conference of the Fédération, at Uppsala in 1965, provided the setting for a decisive series of meetings by the *ad hoc* planning committee of the Institute. Mr. S. Johannson, on the point of being named President of the FIPLV, took part in these meetings, to the extent that his other obligations permitted, and smoothed the way for Scandinavian cooperation.

The *sine qua non* for the success of the project was the full participation of the appropriate German educational and academic authorities. The problem of securing this participation was by no means simple--not for lack of good will but simply because of the way education is organized in Germany. Federalism is no idle word in Germany, least of all in education. Each of the 11 *Länder* composing the Federal German Republic exercises virtually autonomous control over its educational system. The indispensable minimum of national coordination is effected by a "Standing Conference of Regional Cultural Ministers," and the secretariat of this body is the closest approach one can

find in Germany to a national education ministry. But the powers of this secretariat are limited and in the final analysis the acceptance and execution of a project like the Joint Institute depends on the Land-ministries, which control the teaching corps and control or channelize most of the money spent on education.

But to get through to the Land-ministries collectively, it is necessary and appropriate that one pass through the Secretariat of the Standing Conference; and in fact the key to German participation lay in the Pedagogical Exchange Office of the Secretariat. Through the mediation of the Council of Europe, Herr Neumeister, the director of the Exchange Office, was early introduced into the discussion of the project. It was the Exchange Office that secured the official recognition and patronage of the Institute by the Standing Conference. However, Federal German fiscal procedures, with their requirement of two years' lead time for the introduction of a new budgetary item, excluded the possibility of a central government grant covering the anticipated cost of German participation in the tri-lateral program. Nor, in view of the uncertainties of the relative degree of participation of the various regional ministries and their subjection to similar fiscal constraints, could one prudently reckon on a firm prior commitment of funds from those sources. Funding of German participation was arranged for by the intercession of the Exchange Office with the Volkswagen-Stiftung, an important German foundation that is playing a major role in the modernization and renewal of German education.

As concerns Scandinavian participation, the discussions were conducted mainly with Mr. C. A. Axelsson, Director of In-Service Training of the Swedish Board of Education. He played an active and productive role in the planning of the Institute, and undertook to secure the cooperation of other Scandinavian Education Ministries so as to recruit the twenty teachers who were expected to constitute the Scandinavian wing of the Institute triptych. Unfortunately these plans were in great measure frustrated by the protracted illness of the Swedish official; in the upshot, Scandinavian participation in this first Institute fell short of what had been planned.

As the final piece in this complex organizational jig-saw puzzle, mention should be made of the University of Heidelberg, which served as official host to the Institute and delegated to the Sprachkybernetisches Forschungszentrum e.V. the task of furnishing administrative support; nor should we forget the facilities made available by the Mannheim Institute of Technology during the Mannheim phase of the program.

3. Structure and Organization of the Institute. The Institute program fell into two phases. The first, at Mannheim, lasted five weeks and constituted the international program properly speaking: the participants comprised 16 Germans, 2 Swedes, 2 Norwegians, one Dutchman, and 20 Americans. The second phase, at Heidelberg, lasted ten days, during which the American group worked on alone, under the guidance of German and American staff. I propose to describe the program in its entirety but to put the stress on the international phase, which is the proper subject of the report.

a. Guidelines. The program of the Mannheim-Heidelberg Institute, like that of the parallel French one, was visualized as experimental, systemic, socio-cultural and contrastive: These terms describe the concepts that overtly or by implication governed every phase of the Institute program; they describe, in consequence, the attitude and the approach one hoped to inculcate or reinforce among the participants.

In the first place, the desirability of experimental evidence for guiding teaching practice was stressed. On the other hand, care was taken to show how uncertain and dangerous it was to try blindly to apply the findings of experimental psychology to the teacher, the learner, and the learning program in the school situation. Such an emphasis, we felt, would immunize the teacher against an uncritical acceptance of dogmatic pronouncements but at the same time make him accessible to new ideas and procedures that carried the hall mark of adequate experimental verification.

Next, the concept of system, which since de Saussure has been central to linguistics, was largely stressed and progressively extended from the more narrowly

technical field of phonemics, phonology and morpho-syntactics to other areas of concern to language teachers, notably semantics (with the "semantic differential" as a typical principle of order); literature (with practical experience of the European method of explication de texte as a consistent analytic technique); and the socio-cultural matrix of language behavior regarded, in the fashion of Lévi-Strauss, as an anthropological system, but leavened by the close attention to empirical details that marks the approach, say, of Laurence Wylie.

This focus on cultural insight as both the pre-requisite and the goal of foreign language instruction in the schools represents perhaps the most original, certainly the most challenging and difficult feature of the Institute. It has been said, paradoxically but still with a grain of truth, that we have clearer and more systematic notions of the socio-cultural patterns of life among the Trobriand Islanders than we do of the life of any of the "high" cultures of Europe and North America. One reason is obviously that familiarity breeds respect and difficulty in seeing the forest for the trees. Yet the problem of creating the conditions by which the language learner gains insight into the mores, attitudes and values of the cultural entity whose language he is studying is a central one in modern language instruction--it is, at least, to the extent that, in the midst of electro-mechanical and electronic teaching aids (and no one will deny their utility), language instruction does not abandon its function as a humanistic--and humanizing--discipline in order to become simply ad hoc vocational training. After-dinner speakers at a loss what to say to an assembled group of language teachers invariably fall back, during their peroration, on the hoary adage about the study of foreign languages as being the one true road to international peace and brotherhood. On the contrary, "knowledge" of languages unaccompanied by any sympathetic insight into the "otherness" of its native speakers can be a terrifying instrument of discord; it gives voice to prejudices and irascibilities that would otherwise remain in the more ambiguous realm of grunts and shrugs.

The problem is manifest and has been for some time. What is less so is the solution. Both material and methods are lacking. By making the issue a central one in the program of the Institute, we hoped to take a modest step towards its solution.

For this undertaking, as for all the other phases of the Institute, we relied most heavily on two factors--the diverse national origins of the participants and their exceptionally high academic and professional qualifications. With such a group it was feasible to envisage the extensive application of a method of contrastive analysis in large and small groups whose members served alternately as investigators and as "native informants." Once formal lecture-discussions had in some measure provided the participants with a common frame of reference and a common technical vocabulary, the attempt was made to apply the contrastive principle not merely to the analysis of the phonological and syntactic systems of German and English but also to the close study of parallel literary texts in the two languages and to the description of selected features of social attitudes and behavior; as for differences in European and American approaches to language teaching methodology in the schools, one can say that they formed one of the staples of informal conversation among the participants.

These, then, were the guiding principles of the Mannheim-Heidelberg International Institute. The extent to which their selection was realistic and their realization successful will be analyzed after the Institute program has been described and the staff responsible for it named.

b. Physical Facilities. The physical arrangements of the Institute require brief comment.

At Mannheim, as guests of the municipality, we had the use of lecture halls and seminar rooms of the Institute of Technology, which is housed in the reconstructed palace of the Electors of the Pfalz. For the socio-cultural aims of the Institute, Mannheim was a scarcely improvable choice--a medium-sized commercial and industrial

city with an active cultural life, but relatively little frequented by tourists. But the German pattern of school holidays exacted its tribute: the normal university session ran through July, so that for most of the Mannheim phase there were sharp limits set to the space and facilities that could be made available for the administration and, more important, for the informal activities of the Institute. Arrangements for ex cathedra lectures were acceptable, and those for small-team sessions excellent. What could not be supplied was space for the late afternoon and early evening, when participants could get together to drink coffee, exchange ideas, prepare reports and consult the excellent reference library that had been set up for them.

The final phase, at Heidelberg, was much more adequately provided for in these respects; and the speed and thoroughness with which participants took to these additional facilities showed how useful they would have been at Mannheim.

Board and lodgings posed a problem as well. Unlike the case in other European countries, the practice of short-term paying guests in German families is not widespread. Such a solution, while no doubt profitable to the non-German participants, would have been less so to the German ones. In view of the considerable problems of adaptation required if the various national delegations were to work fruitfully together, the best solution would probably have been to lodge and feed them collectively. Such a solution was not possible for this first International Institute; or rather, it would have been, but at too great a sacrifice. One could have found collective quarters for the group at some forest or mountain retreat but the participants would then have been isolated in a "magic mountain" solitude and cut off from the pulse-beat of contemporary German urban life. It was immeasurably more useful for them to be quartered in scattered hotels and pensions, which imposed a greater financial burden than the other solution but also made for a more meaningful experience. Arrangements for group lunches at various restaurants in Mannheim were partially vitiated by distance from the Technical Institute and an unusually long spell of rainy weather.

In spite of conditions of board and lodging that were less than ideal, this aspect of the Mannheim stay did constitute a valuable international experience for some of the participants, who teamed up, Americans, Germans and Scandinavians, to share inexpensive apartments in the city. Although this is not an arrangement one can make in advance, before the national groups have assembled and made acquaintance, one can in the future make plans to encourage such happy accidents.

At Heidelberg most of the participants were inexpensively quartered in university dormitories and fed at the university mensa. The opportunity for easy contact with German university students proved most useful for the various socio-cultural investigations in course.

c. The program. The general plan for the Institute was to concentrate on theoretical lectures and discussions during the first weeks in order to establish common analytic categories for all participants and then gradually to increase the proportion of guided small group activities and investigations until, during the final, Heidelberg phase, they largely dominated the daily program.

The major themes of the program--and hence of this account of them--were linguistic theory, contrastive phonology, the psychology of language learning, teaching methodology and contrastive cultural analysis, within which a special place was made for literature and stylistics.

1) Linguistic Theory. Professor W. Freeman Twaddell provided the main series of six lectures on "Models of Language," during which he developed in systematic outlines the elements of linguistic theory most relevant to the concerns of language teachers. Particularly original and noteworthy were two lectures devoted to the problems of vocabulary acquisition and reading skill, matters of pedagogical importance but neglected in linguistic discussions. I supplemented this series with a lecture on the theory of transformational generative grammar; the practical implications of this theory for the construction of language drill materials were then expounded by Mr. Allerton, lecturer on Linguistics at the University of Manchester. Finally, Dr. Grebe,

director of the German Language Institute at Mannheim, provided a brief survey of inhaltbezogene Grammatik ("content-oriented grammar"), the principal tendency in contemporary linguistic analysis in Germany. An interesting and encouraging conclusion to emerge from his talk and the following discussion was the strong convergence apparent between the "inhaltbezogene" and structural schools of linguistics. On the day following his talk, Dr. Grebe received the seminar participants at his Institute and showed them how lexicographical and linguistic operations were executed there.

2) Contrastive Phonology. Under this heading fall two fairly distinct sets of activities:

First, a series of formal presentations by the Institute's two resident phonetics specialists, Mr. Allerton and Diplom-Psychologist Richter of the Phonetics Institute of the University of Cologne. In a sober, pragmatically oriented series of five talks, Mr. Allerton developed a three-way contrast among German, Received Pronunciation, and General American, with the last of which he had a good theoretical acquaintance. In his seven formal talks (the last two during the Heidelberg phase), Herr Richter expounded a strikingly original set of theses about speech perception and production. In part to supplement these lectures and point up their implications for language teaching, I delivered a talk on perceptual problems in early second-language learning at Mannheim, and a lecture-demonstration about instrumental speech analysis at Heidelberg.

The second aspect of the phonetics program was a workshop in remedial phonetics, designed with the double purpose of assisting the participants themselves to a firmer grasp of the target-language sound system and of sharpening their insight into the speech-discrimination and -production problems of their students. These phonetics Praktika, conducted in part in a language laboratory, were the one occasion when the Institute members were separated according to mother tongue. The German teachers of English worked under Mr. Allerton's guidance, the non-German teachers of German under Herr Richter's, for 1½ to 3 hours a week. Given the exceptionally fluent and accurate English articulation of the German group, Mr. Allerton concentrated his efforts on drill in the stress and intonation contours of Southern British; such drill also served an exemplary purpose in focussing attention on that aspect of foreign language phonology that is often most neglected or least well handled in school instruction.

On the other hand, Herr Richter, working with the non-German participants, concentrated on the segmental features of German, but in a novel and experimental way: In a few short, intensive sessions the group was familiarized with the elements of close phonetic transcription. Then, in the language laboratory, they performed such a transcription on a short corpus of German utterances of one of the group, whose speech had a large number of typically American features. Out of the painstaking analysis of this corpus and its comparison with an authentically German one and with the American articulatory features that were at the source of the interference, it was expected that participants would get much more insight into the nature of the problem as regards both their own articulation and that of their pupils, than through more conventional discussions or drills. It is not yet possible to assert whether this expectation was realized. Individual tapes made at the start and end of the exercise are still being analyzed at Cologne and Heidelberg in order to assess the effect of training.

In passing, it may also be mentioned that the corpus of American-accented German assembled for this purpose also served as the starting point for another investigation, one suggested by a talk that Professor Starr gave at the Institute. He referred to the different degrees of acceptability that various types and features of foreign "accent" (American say) would find in the ears of native German speakers. The Cologne Phonetics Institute and the Heidelberg SKF are exploring this question with the help of the corpus, supplemented as necessary with additional recordings of American speakers of German. What one hopes to work toward is a statistically significant hierarchy of native German preferences and dislikes with regard to various types and degrees of interference from American speech habits. The eventual pedagogical utility of such a quantitatively derived hierarchy is apparent.

The transcription exercise was carried on through the Heidelberg phase of the Institute. During this phase a parallel series of individual diagnostic sessions was also initiated: Each participant who was not a native speaker of German consulted with Herr Richter, who pointed out interference features in his speech, located them by reference to the typical corpus he was transcribing, and outlined possible types of drill and the stages by which deviant realizations could be eliminated.

3) The Psychology of Language Learning. Under this heading is subsumed in the first instance a set of lecture-discussions by Prof. Graumann, director of the Psychological Institute of the University of Heidelberg, and two members of his staff, Drs. Bredenkamp and Solle. In two talks Dr. Bredenkamp summarized the current state of psychological research on verbal learning and retention. In the course of the ensuing discussions it became clear that only in a limited and extremely cautious way could one generalize the findings of the laboratory experiment and apply them to second-language instruction in the schools. However, one can reasonably maintain that the recognition of these limits, as it emerged from the dialogue between psychologists and language pedagogues, was itself a salutary learning experience for the participants in the Institute.

Dr. Solle, who had spent a year at the Harvard Center for Cognitive Behavior, addressed himself during four talks to topics of central importance for language instruction: the role of imitation and analogy in language learning; foreign language aptitude; audio-visual methods; and principles of programmed instruction.

Professor Graumann made valuable contributions in his series of talks on selected aspects of psycholinguistics. Among the highlights, one can particularly mention: a phenomenological analysis of the child upon his first encounter with a foreign language; an interpretation of Weinreich's categories of bilingualism in terms of a psychological model based on Osgood's theory of "representational mediating processes"; the use of the semantic differential test in cross-cultural studies of related verbal concepts; a brief survey of research in progress at the Heidelberg Psychological Institute on intercultural psycholinguistics and linguistic sociology. In connection with the discussion of the semantic differential, Prof. Graumann and his staff conducted a small paradigmatic experiment with the participants, who were supplemented, for greater statistical validity, by a number of German university students. Connotative profiles were established for three English terms--"society," "history," "official"--and three related German ones--Gesellschaft, Geschichte, Beamter. Though a semantic differential test on so small a scale must necessarily be inconclusive, several suggestive differences between the German and the (largely) American group did appear and were particularly interesting in that they did not correspond to the common stereotypes concerning national traits.

The portion of the Institute program handled by Prof. Graumann and his staff did not provide participants with a set of handy tips and devices for use in the classroom. That was not the intention. Instead, the set of lecture discussions provided a framework--or rather, a series of different ones--that was new to most of the participants and in which, if they cared and had the intellectual drive to do so, they could envisage the process of language learning, and their own role as mediators of the process, in a new light.

4) Language Teaching Methodology. Several different modes of handling the theme of the practical application of linguistics and psychology to language teaching were tried out in the course of the Institute:

-Lecture discussions. Besides the discussion led by Mr. Allerton on transformational grammar and pattern practice, Mr. van Teslaar treated pedagogical problems involved in learning new sound systems; areas of optimal use of the language laboratory and limits to its effectiveness; principles and techniques of language-laboratory program development; information-theoretical and perceptual principles governing the use of visual aids in language instruction. Prof. Twaddell summarized his experience and recommendations as a senior collaborator in the creation of German-language textbooks.

-Participant-centered presentations and demonstrations. Here are to be mentioned several loosely structured group discussions and demonstrations in which participants were expected to contribute insights from their own experience and provide comparative information on school practice in their various national or regional systems. One such session, for example, involved informal reports on the place and function of phonetics training in the early phases of language instruction. An evening showing of language training films was the occasion for a vigorous discussion of the merits and drawbacks of electromechanical teaching aids in the classroom. A "shock" session was also organized, during which participants responded in group to portions of language laboratory repetition drills in Pushto and in Brazilian Portuguese. The experience had its usual traumatizing effect in evoking protests about the lack of clarity of the recording and the excessive length of the utterances presented for repetition. This session was followed by one in which Mr. Kavaliunas, a participant, guided the group in an initial session of Lithuanian instruction and Professor Starr gave a similar demonstration in Mandarin Chinese. Finally, during the so-called Pedagogical Praktika, the participants, who were divided into small groups, worked out sets of discussion topics on problems of language teaching. The concealed purpose of this task was to bring the participants into a relatively intensive yet still informal exchange of pedagogical ideas and experiences. The ostensible--and not inconsiderable--purpose of this set task was to provide a guide for the scheduled Friday panel discussions.

-Weekly panel on pedagogical applications of linguistics and learning theory. It was early recognized that the various lecture and discussion subprograms constituted a perhaps excessively rich diet of theory for the participants; moreover, with three different areas of scientific theory and research being handled simultaneously--structural linguistics, phonetics and phonology, and psycholinguistics, each with its own terminology, terms of reference and modes of attack--it was inevitable that participants experienced some difficulty in achieving a synoptic grasp of the Institute program as a whole. Only as the Institute advanced and drew to a close could one expect the arches linking the three areas of theory to one another and to the pragmatic teaching concerns of the participants to begin emerging. In order to hasten the process, time was set aside every Friday for a "symposium," as we rather grandly called our panel discussion. The panel was composed of the regular exponents of the theoretical disciplines: Twaddell and van Teslaar for linguistics, Allerton and Richter for phonology, and Aries representing the psycholinguistics team. At the sessions the theoretical lectures and discussions of the week were to be interpreted in the light of the discussion themes drawn up in the Pedagogical Praktika and the implications for teaching practice were to be unfolded. By questions directed to one or another member of the panel the participants themselves were expected to provide the gist for the discussion.

5) Contrastive Cultural Analysis. This portion of the program represented the most original and experimental part of the Institute. Anticipatorily one can say that though it wasn't as successful as it might have been, and was a source of misunderstanding and confusion to many, the results were promising enough to suggest the interest and value of reorganizing this phase of the work and carrying on with it in the future.

The contrastive analysis was carried out through various modalities--lectures, small team discussions, and guided enquêtes or "field studies." An interesting feature of this work was also the attempt to integrate exercises of close textual analysis of literary works (explication de textes) with contrastive cultural preoccupations.

Lectures. Professor Starr struck the keynote with an opening address on language as the expression of cultural differences and the key to cross-cultural insight. Dr. Breitling of the Political Institute of the University of Heidelberg

provided a stimulating survey of socio-economic conditions in Germany since the war. However, the main burden of formal presentation of the contrastive cultural theme was assumed by Professor Marckwardt in a concentrated series of lectures on subjects such as the social history of the American Language, American literature as the expression of American experience, the place of cross-cultural information in secondary school language courses and the outlines of a regionally neutral grammar for the study of English as a foreign language.

Team Discussions. Small teams of mixed nationality selected, discussed and wrote up brief analyses of suggestive cross-cultural topics such as differences in the definition of school misbehavior, differences in usage concerning tips and gratuities, differences in non-verbal indices of social rank and status.

Enquêtes. Subjects for investigation were chosen, some interviews were conducted and some data were collected during the international phase of the Institute; but it was during the last two weeks that the program went into high gear. A young German sociologist or social psychologist was assigned as informant and guide to each now purely American team; portable tape recorders had been issued and secretarial services were made available for the transcription of recorded interviews and other data; and except for a morning lecture and an afternoon briefing and report session, the teams worked uninterruptedly and hard on assembling and organizing their information. The result was a series of reports, of unequal value objectively, but all reflecting the close interaction with informants and at least in some measure the prise de conscience of cultural differences that constituted the reason and rationale of the task.

Literary Analysis and Stylistics. It may seem anomalous to discuss the literary aspect of the Institute program under the heading of cross-cultural analysis; in fact, as I have mentioned, the attempt was made to combine some practice in the close textual analysis of literary texts (explication de textes) with the use of the same texts as socio-cultural documents.

During the final, Heidelberg phase, Dr. Schnitzler, director of the German Institute of the University, did conduct two exemplary sessions of close stylistic analysis of passages from Döblin and Musil, where the emphasis was on aesthetic values; but in the regular stylistics Praktika of the Mannheim phase, the task was essentially the socio-cultural annotation of passages from Arthur Miller's Death of a Salesman and Horst Monnich's radiophonic play Kopfgeld. It had originally been planned to get at the problem by way of translation: the non-German members of the group would prepare rough translations of the American original into German, the German members would translate the German original into English. Out of small-group discussion of these versions would emerge a clearer insight into the socio-cultural presuppositions inherent in the use of a language.

This plan foundered on the opposition of some of the participants, an opposition that was itself the reflection of culturally conditioned differences in the use of the term "translation." For the planners of the Institute, the word meant the highly sophisticated search for connotative equivalencies, in order to confront the participants in the most immediate way with the problem of linguistic incommensurability. To some of the participants, however, translation was too much the kind of task one assigned to schoolboys for it to be acceptable as a serious adult pursuit.

An alternate procedure was adopted: The working groups were asked to imagine that they had received the commission to prepare an annotated edition of the Miller play for use in a secondary school English class, and a similar edition of Kopfgeld for use in an American high school or freshman college German course. They were to presuppose on the part of the students very little information on the socio-cultural background of the works in question beyond what is conveyed in the prevalent national stereotypes. In other words, the teams were to attempt to tease out as fully as they could the cultural implications of the German and American texts, so as to make them more comprehensible to relatively unsophisticated members of the other culture. Some general guidance in the explication of the texts was provided: Dr. Breitling analyzed the factual veracity of Kopfgeld as a reflection of the German "economic

miracle"; R. Schneider, of the Heidelberg German Institute, provided some preliminary glosses to the same text. By special arrangement the group was able to hear the recording of the original radio performance of the drama; Professor Marckwardt illustrated the desired approach with a close analysis of passages from Thornton Wilder's Our Town, an alternate text which was available to most of the participants. Nonetheless, in spite of this assistance, the main responsibility for the task lay with the small groups themselves, and they executed it with varying degrees of success. It is worth noting that the persons who objected most strenuously to the original idea of analysis by translation failed to contribute much to the modified task of analysis by annotation.

6) Supporting Activities. A reasonably varied selection of supplementary and "extra-curricular" activities was offered.

First mention should go to a little series of lectures on "Trends in Contemporary German Cultural Life" which were scheduled for Fridays as a change of diet from the more austere programmatic lectures. They were directed primarily at the non-German members of the Institute, many of whom, it was felt, might not be fully in touch with recent developments in German life and letters; on the whole the talks proved stimulating to the German participants as well, who took vigorous part in the subsequent discussions. For these guest lectures, appeal was naturally made to academic authorities (Professor Kielwein, former Rector of the University of Saarbrücken, on German school and university reform); but one also had worth-while surveys from journalists (Dr. Kuntz, drama critic of the Rhein-Neckar Zeitung, on German stage life; Dr. Lehner, literary director of the Southwest German radio, on German literature since the War). And in two cases, it was practicing artists who discoursed on their contemporaries: the abstract painter Göltenboth spoke on the graphic arts; Mauricio Kargel, a leading member of the Cologne abstract music group, gave a vivid and convincing account of current musical aesthetics illustrated with selections of his own composition.

Institute participants had access to a reference library composed of titles selected from the holdings of the SKF Documentation Center. The collection was strong on linguistics, psycholinguistics and language pedagogy, less satisfactory in representative language course programs, particularly in sample tape recordings. The utility of the library was limited chiefly by the small amount of free time left over from programmed daytime activities, and in Mannheim, by difficulties of evening access. However, participants could borrow books for evening perusal, and many availed themselves of the opportunity. One feature introduced timidly and experimentally this year might probably be taken up more whole-heartedly in future Institutes, particularly during the second week: Moulton's new book on linguistics and language learning, fresh off the press, was available in five copies. Five participants each prepared and delivered a ten-minute oral resume of a key chapter of the work; after each presentation and at the end of the session, the staff led the discussion on questions arising out of the presentations. Generalization of this procedure would bring several advantages: in addition to allowing rapid, systematic coverage of certain essential texts, it would reinforce the sense of participation of Institute members and accelerate the emergence of a group sense.

Two formal reception ceremonies were held: at Mannheim, leading officials of the city received the Institute group for a lunch, followed by an instructive guided boat tour of the city's industrial port. At Heidelberg the Pro-rektor of the University greeted the Institute with a welcoming address. A chartered bus trip to Council of Europe headquarters at Strasbourg allowed participants to gain an insight into the Council's diverse activities in the field of modern foreign language instruction in Europe. A bus-and-boat excursion along the Rhine and various evening social gatherings complete the list of formally organized activities of the Institute.

III. Evaluation.

In this section of the report I propose to examine the concept of the International Institute and the way it was realized, from the point of view of the European,

particularly the German, participant and sponsor. What concerns us here is to use the experience of the first joint Institute to reach conclusions about the utility of this innovation on the European educational scene, the extent of its appeal to European educational authorities and to eventual participants, and in consequence the long-term viability of the whole notion.

In this perspective there is little purpose in rehearsing such defects or shortcomings of the first Institute as were of a contingent and ephemeral nature; whatever place they may have in a balanced judgement of the first Institute itself, they can play no role in a prognosis concerning future Institutes. In fact, they must be expressly ignored in such an evaluation, just as they would presumably be eliminated from the future Institutes themselves.

1. There is no doubt that the notion of associating European and American teachers in a joint training program is one to which European administrators and teachers respond readily and often enthusiastically. This is a central fact which must be firmly held on to in the discussion that follows on the problems that stand in the way of translating this wide assent in principle into a firm and detailed program of action. It is this fact which justifies and makes possible the search for solutions that do justice to the interests and expectations of all the parties concerned.

Precisely the different expectations on the part of various participants and of some of the sponsoring officials were a source of misunderstanding and difficulty. In the minds of those responsible for the Institute, it was to be conducted at a high level; the participants would be linguistically sophisticated, experienced pedagogues occupying positions of responsibility. Some familiarity with current trends in language teaching, with audio-visual methods, with the use and limits of the language laboratory, was presupposed. It was expected and hoped that in their informal discussions the participants would compare and exchange notes on the "tricks of the trade," that is, on their different ways of handling specific methodological problems within the context of their different school systems, pedogogical traditions and teaching goals. However, the formal activities of the Institute were to be focussed on a more or less systematic exploration and review of the psycholinguistic factors underlying second-language learning and in particular on a prise de conscience of the need for a sensitive awareness of socio-cultural distinctions as a goal and condition of second-language mastery.

There is a certain asynchronism apparent in the spread of educational technology on either side of the Atlantic. In most European countries the language laboratory is only starting to make its massive entry in the public school. It comes wrapped in a certain mystique implying special techniques and esoteric skills for its proper use. And in its wake it undeniably brings the urgent need for recorded course programs, which for the most part are still lacking in Europe.

This search for course material to be used in the language laboratory is a common preoccupation of teachers and administrators in several European countries, whereas it is not a major concern of most American teachers. Rightly or wrongly, the Americans are regarded elsewhere as initiates into the fine art of creating recorded language drills. The proposal of a joint European-American seminar is greeted with uncritical acceptance by many teaching circles in Europe because of the assumption, avowed or not, justified or not, that such a seminar will introduce the European participants into the detailed arcana of language lab course production.

It was inevitable that this expectation be to some degree disappointed by the first Joint Institute. The expressed purpose of the Institute was of a different and less technical order; to be sure, it was hoped that the Institute would mediate a rich insight into psycholinguistic principles underlying drill construction, but it was not intended that the Institute be primarily a workshop for the construction of laboratory drill materials. As a matter of fact, the Institute did even less along that line than had been planned. It had been expected that small working teams of mixed nationality would receive assignments to prepare--under staff supervision--drills of particular phonological or structural features of English and German, and in this way bring to a

focus the theoretic principles of linguistics and learning theory expounded in the formal lectures. Unfortunately, the curriculum of the Institute turned out to be too ambitious--an embarrassment of riches, in fact. Amidst the formal lectures, the panels and group discussions, the phonetics and socio-cultural workshops, it was not possible to find a place for these difficult and necessarily time-consuming pedagogical exercises.

In the eyes of the European participants, this failure to provide practical experience in producing laboratory materials was without question the principal shortcoming of the first Joint Institute. In part their disappointment reflected inadequate briefing about the expressed purposes of the Institute by the administrative agencies that had selected them to attend. The remedy lies obviously in a more thorough and explicit orientation of these agencies by those responsible for the Institute.

In part, though, the remedy must involve changing the Institute program to bring it more into conformity with European needs and desires. In the process a delicate balance must be struck between the not perfectly coincident requirements of Europeans and Americans. As we have suggested, the American teacher is not usually required to produce his own laboratory drill materials unless he wants to; the wide availability of published materials frees him from this necessity. The case is different in Europe, where the shortage of such materials, coupled with the accelerating spread of language laboratories, is forcing many teachers to be their own programmers.

The solution lies not so much in the direction of transforming the Joint Institute into a technical course on language laboratory programming as in the execution of the original plan of guided small-team pedagogical workshops. The aim should be to mediate basic principles of learning, not simply to transmit a set of programming techniques which would be of no particular concern to the American participants. In order to make this possible, certain other features of the program of the first Institute should be sacrificed; in particular, the number of <u>ex cathedra</u> lectures should be decreased.

In any case, this overriding European concern with programming is a transitory phenomenon accompanying the present penury of language laboratory course materials. This deficit will be overcome within the next few years and the need to convert teachers into programmers will correspondingly abate. Practice in programming drill exercises in a teaching Institute will be more readily recognized as simply a useful device for inculcating and demonstrating an intimate familiarity with learning principles that are as valid in the classroom as in the language laboratory.

2. A second difficulty attendant upon European participation in a Joint Institute springs from an attitude toward vacation-period teacher training that is different from the American one. With all due recognition of the fragility of such a generalization, one can say that the European teacher <u>starts</u> his teaching career better prepared academically than his American colleague. As a result, there is much less need felt by the teacher himself, and by his supervisors, for further formal in-service training. Add the fact of generally overcrowded classes and the resultant heavy workload on the teacher during regular school sessions; add the additional fact that there is no clearly defined administrative procedure whereby efforts at self-improvement lead unambiguously to promotions or other tokens of increased status, and we have a sufficient explanation of the absence of tradition of participation in substantial summer-time training courses. Vacations tend to be sacrosanct. The secondary school teacher will participate willingly enough in short conferences and week-long seminars. Five-week courses go beyond his habitual experience; he is in general reticent about volunteering for them, and his supervisors about assigning him to them.

This fact poses delicate organizational and curricular problems, since American participation in a Joint Institute in Europe must obviously be predicated on a course length that justifies the expense of distant travel and is compatible with prevailing American training doctrine and practice.

However, the problem posed by this conflict of traditions is probably destined to resolve itself naturally in the coming years. Technological and methodological

innovation is a great leveller. The uneasy feeling is gradually taking hold among teachers and administrators that considerably more than a weekend seminar is needed if the schools are to meet the challenge posed by the quantum-shift in language teaching methods and materials that Europe, after the United States, is now experiencing. In anticipation of a point to be made later in this report, it should be noted that this growing awareness of the need for recyclage is by no means limited to the field of language instruction. The "New Mathematics"is by all evidence on the point of starting its probably decade-long conquest of continental Europe; and where the "New Mathematics" has gone, the "New Physics," the "New Chemistry" and the "New Biology" are certain to follow. Programmed and audio-visual instruction have already begun to pose their challenge to traditional teaching methods. Recognition of the need for continuous readaptation is certain to impose itself on the teaching corps and lead to the fuller acceptance of the long in-service training course. And one can predict that joint programs with Americans will be welcome in all these areas, in which American experience predates European.

One cannot, however, overcome present inhibitions simply by appealing to the likelihood of future acceptance; for Joint Institutes to be held in the next few years it might be desirable to envisage a transitional formula that will satisfy different views of the appropriate length for such programs. In the 1966 Institute, the international phase ran for five weeks and the purely American one for two weeks more. This schedule is itself a compromise, and an objectively satisfactory one in terms of training goals. But if recruitment of a full quota of European participants for a five-week program should prove too difficult, one ought to be ready to fall back on an alternate plan involving two successive three-week international programs. Those Europeans who could would attend both cycles. Otherwise, they would attend one or the other. The two cycles would be planned as independent, integral units: for example, the first cycle might be integrated about psycholinguistic themes, the second one about contrastive socio-cultural ones; or alternatively and perhaps preferably, a different set of problems in both fields could be treated in each of the cycles.

3. One difference between European and American school curricula is responsible for an additional difficulty, of a less radical sort but nonetheless deserving of brief mention: the pupils of the American participants are on the average some three or four years older than their European counterparts. By and large, foreign language instruction in the United States still starts in high school, with children 13 - 14 years old. In Germany and elsewhere in Europe, instruction in English as the first foreign language starts for most pupils at the age of ten. This chronological difference is naturally perpetuated at every stage of subsequent instruction. When the German teacher speaks of teaching literature, he has adolescents of 15, 16 and 17 years in mind whereas the American is thinking in terms of college freshmen, sophomores, and even juniors. During the 1966 Institute this difference in the student bodies to which the participants from either side of the Atlantic were tacitly referring led to some misunderstanding and talking at cross purposes, which a belated recognition of the source only in part alleviated. One remedy in future Institutes would be to give preference to FLES teachers among the American candidates; another is to ensure that all participants recognize the difference in their reference groups early in the program, and make allowance for it in all discussions.

4. The 1966 Institute erred on the side of excessive ambition. But precisely this diversity of subjects and treatments made of the first Institute an excellent experimental terrain, in that it was possible to ascertain what problems most immediately engaged the attention of the participants, what modes of treatment proved most effective and--no less essential--what dangers of cross-cultural misunderstanding lurked in unexpected corners. Out of this first experience emerges a clearer and more precise vision of the lines of force along which future Institutes should operate. Further experience will doubtless suggest further improvements and simplifications but is unlikely to modify radically the outlines of the program as it is here adumbrated.

The work of the Institute should be focussed on two areas, applied contrastive

linguistics and contrastive socio-cultural contexts of language use. It should make no attempt to cover more than a limited number of the relevant factors. Emphasis should be shifted from formal, ex cathedra lectures to relatively informal reports and presentations by the participants themselves, who should be recognized and treated as resource personnel. In line with the strongly pragmatic orientation of the participants, the learning procedures of the Institute should be inductive and problem-oriented.

The preferred pattern of organization should be the small work-team of mixed nationality. The best platform for launching the program would be a series of specific tasks assigned to the work-teams for completion and submission by the end of the Institute.

In applied linguistics these assignments could most profitably take the form of drafting language laboratory drills or textbook treatments or class-instructional plans for a set of phonological or morphosyntactic problems in English and German, both naturally handled on a contrastive basis in a manner designed to facilitate learning by native speakers of the other language. The staff of the Institute would serve as advisors to the teams and guide them with their advice and with suggestions of appropriate texts for consultation; formal lectures on linguistics, psycholinguistics, learning theory, and methodology would make explicit reference to the preoccupations of the work-teams, as would reports and panel discussions analyzing existing course materials.

The work on contrastive socio-cultural analysis would be similarly organized in terms of specific missions. These missions would take any or all of the following forms:

a. The preparation of detailed annotations of the socio-cultural assumptions and implications of passages selected from German and American literary texts suitable for use or actually used in secondary school instruction. Texts for which a translation into the other language exists are to be preferred, since a close comparison of the original and its translation can be a fruitful source of insight.

b. The compilation of "cultural notes" reflecting faits de civilisation readily available to members of a given national or cultural community but usually unknown to foreign students.

c. Carefully focussed "anthropological" field investigations employing observation and interview with each team operating under the close guidance of an assigned sociologist, social psychologist, or when possible, sociolinguist.

Altogether, the execution of this phase of the Institute program is a most delicate matter, as the experience of the 1966 Institute showed. The difficulties are manifold. There is a lack of a uniform, generally accepted methodology and body of data. (Prof. Twaddell likened the problems the 1966 Institute encountered in the field of contrastive cultural analysis to those it would have encountered in the field on contrastive linguistic analysis before the emergence of descriptive linguistics). As a consequence of this lack, there exists the constant temptation and danger of the facile generalization about national traits, with the resultant irritation of the national susceptibilities of the participants. Compounding these other difficulties, the novelty of the "anthropological" approach in the eyes of many of the participants inhibits an appreciation of its relevance to their classroom activities.

Upon rehearsing this catalogue of difficulties one may ask whether the game is worth the candle or whether one wouldn't make life much simpler by dropping this phase from the program of future Institutes. In spite of the difficulties, the fruitless talk and lost motion engendered by the attempt to come to terms with this theme during the 1966 Institute, one approached the desired goal asymptotically a sufficient number of times, one sufficiently often caught a glimpse of what this sort of activity could lead to in the way of heightened awareness of culturally determined aspects of second-language acquisition and use, as to strengthen belief in the urgency and necessity of the task. The experience of the first attempt at it was sufficiently chastening, though, as to suggest a certain number of irrefrangible principles in preparation

for a second try. The participants must be extensively briefed on this phase of the program prior to the start of the Institute and during its first days. They must be convinced intellectually at least, if not affectively, that non-cultural analysis is a meaningful and important pursuit. Freely rambling discussion is to be avoided in favor of discussion based on clear and specific problems and questions from which one does not stray. Prepared fully-thought-out descriptions of limited phenomena are to be preferred to impromptu generalizations. The confrontation of cultures becomes more precise if it is conducted on a bilateral basis. At least during the first years, until a stable doctrine and fixed procedures have been established, the composition of the Institute should be essentially bi-national American and German; a limited number of other nationals should be admitted to participate, but on the understanding that they fall in with a program conceived in bi-national terms and adjust their attitudes and expectations accordingly.

If these precautions are taken, there is no doubt that this aspect of the Institute program will produce benefits justifying the special precautions needed to execute it. For a variety of reasons, it seems likely that the emphasis in language learning during the coming years will gradually shift from the atomistic acquisition of phonology and structural skills to a more cognitive and integrative mastery of a total pattern of language as behavior; as a result the socio-cultural context of language use will bulk very large indeed. The Joint Institute can contribute powerfully to creating a mental climate favorable to this desirable shift of emphasis; its influence in this sense will probably be even stronger in Europe than in America in view of the relative paucity of other institutions for further teacher training and because of the influential role that the expected European participants would play on their regional and even national education systems. Moreover, it is not too sanguine to hope that out of the annual cycles of the Institute would emerge a growing mass of systematically organized information and observations useful to teachers and course developers and even valuable as source material to social psychologists and other students of cultural differences.

5. The work of the Joint Institute should then be sharply concentrated on selected problems in the fields of applied contrastive linguistics and contrastive cultural analysis. Such a focus should not exclude certain other activities which on the basis of experience with the 1966 Institute merit a subsidiary place on the curriculum.

A phonology workshop is one such activity. The exceptionally high level of target-language mastery exhibited by all participants in the 1966 Institute, if it is maintained in future years, precludes the necessity for elementary phonetic drill. However, a useful function would be served by a program of individual consultations, by participants who were non-native speakers of the instructional target languages, with staff phoneticians, at which deviant speech habits could be analyzed and remedial exercises conducted.

The possible techniques for conducting a class session constitute a subject of perennial and legitimate interest to all teachers. School visits and the inspection <u>in situ</u> of various types of language instruction are the obvious ways to satisfy this curiosity. However, the period of the year when the Institute is held puts any visit to secondary school classes out of the question. More feasible and even more useful would be the analysis and discussion of classroom teaching procedures observed in kinescope recordings of actual classes. This possibility should be actively explored for future Institutes. Altogether, the use of easily prepared and indefinitely repeatable kinescopic tapes holds out a bright promise for teacher training generally.

Finally, the supplementary lecture-<u>cum</u>-discussion series entitled "Trends in Contemporary German Culture" should be retained in future Institutes and even be expanded to include a parallel series on American trends. An interesting feature of this series was the occasional talk not by a critic or academic scholar but by a practicing artist. In such cases the point of view presented may be less than fully objective and synoptic, but these defects are more than balanced by the vigor, the

immediacy, the sense of personal involvement that the artist communicates. Extending the impact of this series beyond the confines of the Institute itself, one can visualize the texts of these talks assembled into an extremely worth-while publication.

IV. Concluding Remarks.

1. So far this report has traced the genesis and realization of the first Joint European-US Language Teaching Institute at Mannheim/Heidelberg in 1966. After describing in detail the program of the Institute, the report went on to extract the lessons to be learned from the experience of this Institute.

The pilot Institute in 1966 was long and difficult to organize. Minor administrative deficiencies and a far too ambitious and variegated curriculum kept the Institute itself from being as successful as one might have hoped. And even though the foundations for a long-range program have now been laid, various organizational difficulties are certain to recur in preparing future Institutes, partly as a result of transitory circumstances; current efforts to balance the Federal German budget and the resulting retrenchment in public spending constitutes one such complicating factor that is already making itself felt in the preparation of coming Institutes. And no doubt other hurdles will rise from time to time. But after all, a characteristic of life at every level, from the biological to the social and historical, is successful response to challenge.

And in the present case--this is unquestionably the conclusion one can rationally draw from the 1966 Institute--the challenge embodied in the idea of the international Institute is worthy of the efforts required earlier, now and in the future to embody it in increasingly perfect form. To the extent that they feel the need for a sense of community that transcends national and geographic boundaries, all men of good will can subscribe to the idea. But there is no need to make appeal to so high-flown and therefore diffuse an emotion. Within its special field of action, that of the further training of modern language teachers and supervisors, the International Institute opens up a new dimension; it provides a peculiarly suitable arena for the difficult but exciting struggle to lay bare the deeply integrated set of attitudes, the "cultural system" that shapes language behavior, and to give this system the central prominence in foreign language instruction that is its rightful due. Over recent decades the trend in language teaching has been to emphasize language as a vehicle of oral communication at the expense of language as a means of access to a foreign literature. Critics of this trend argue that it substitutes training for education, in other words, that the humanizing potential of foreign language instruction is sacrificed for narrowly pragmatic ends. To the extent there is some justice in this observation, the answer lies not so much in a return to the petrified values and priorities of traditional instruction as in a resolute advance into the still largely unexplored domain of the different set of cultural values inherent in even the humblest and most unprepossessing utterances of another language. To the extent that the learner can be brought to a sympathetic awareness of this "otherness" and to the effort of imagination and insight needed to lay aside briefly his habitual cultural references and adopt others when he enters the sphere of the foreign language, to that same extent will he have undergone a more truly humanistic experience than any to be gained from the painful decipherment of a foreign classic.

One can try to propagate such an idea in mono-national teaching seminars and institutes; in such a context, though, it takes on the blurred outlines of a high-minded exhortation. Only the Joint Institute can provide the setting where systematic cross-cultural differences are not merely discussed but actively explored, experienced, <u>lived</u>. And such a total confrontation is necessary if the idea is to pass from seminar theory into classroom practice. Not intellectual assent alone but intense commitment is necessary for a teacher to be willing to undertake the immensely difficult task of

integrating the protean and still inchoate theme of cultural differences into his habitual teaching activities. Suppose we ignore the signal benefits achieved for the guided exploration of the principles of contrastive linguistic analysis in a setting where every participant is by turn investigator and native informant; the graphic immediacy given to the perception and study of cross-cultural distinctions by itself more than justifies the existence of the Joint Institute.

2. So much, then for the central conclusion of this report. Are there any other considerations that impose themselves during these closing pages? Yes, several.

I recommended that during the first few years the Joint Institutes be essentially bi-lateral. However, Americans need not necessarily be the preordained partners of Germans in a German Institute. Such a pairing is especially useful in view of the trans-Atlantic distances involved and the correspondingly greater remoteness of the two cultures; but such an arrangement in no way excludes the possibility of other pairings. Joint Franco-German and Anglo-German Institutes seem like reasonable ideas, too. A belief in their worth strong enough to induce the appropriate educational authorities to put up the money needed is the major requirement. One can hope that the results of the first few cross-Atlantic Institutes will help generate such strong convictions.

3. Both partners unquestionably benefited from their participation in the Joint Institute. As far as the contrastive-cultural aspect of the program was concerned, though, the Americans obviously benefited rather more equally--as George Orwell would say--than the Germans. The thought arises whether reciprocity is not feasible. One doesn't want to blow a reasonable idea up to the point where it bursts into impracticality. Nonetheless, a sort of double Institute, meeting one summer in Germany and the other one in the United States, might not prove unwieldy. And with the cooperation of the sponsoring universities in making inexpensive board and lodging available, the expenses of the plan might be kept within acceptable limits. Once the system was in full operation, a total of four groups would be simultaneously involved: In the United States, an American group starting the first lap of the course would be paired with a German group that had started on the program during the previous summer in Germany; in Germany a beginning German group would be paired with the American group from the previous summer's American Institute. In other words, each group would take part, the first summer, in the Institute held on its home grounds and the following summer, in the overseas Institute. The participating groups would be different from one summer to the next. It is not likely that this change in partners would have an unfavorable effect. What is certain is the reinforcement of assiduity and morale that the prospect of a sojourn overseas the following summer would have on participants in the first lap. With such a prospect, they would probably be willing to play a full role as native informants for the socio-cultural phase of the program and thus make it possible to perform an intensive summer-long analysis of each target culture.

4. For realizing the program just outlined--whether all of it or whatever part of it turned out to be practical--the Fédération Internationale des Professeurs de Langues Vivantes (FIPLV) could play an important role. Its help would also be desirable even for the more modest goal of assuring the perennity of Joint Institutes growing out of the 1966 one.

The FIPLV could lend its moral support by agreeing to serve alongside the Council of Europe as a joint sponsor of the project; and it could lend its professional support by sending expert observers to the Institutes to help suggest improvements. Acting through the appropriate national associations, it could help assure the widest possible dissemination of information about the project among members of the language teaching profession. This information should go beyond the simple existence of the project and serve to deepen understanding of the special purpose and spirit of the Institutes. Once again acting through its national associations, the FIPLV could help enlist and maintain the interest of national and regional education authorities, whose continued support of the Institutes is the necessary condition of their survival and growth.

5. Up to this point the discussion has been carried on almost entirely in terms of advanced continuation training for foreign language teachers, and this is unquestionably the area where the idea of the joint multi-lingual Institute finds its easiest and most logical application. However, the principle is by no means limited in its potential applications simply to language teaching. One can visualize many other types of mutually fructifying cross-national learning experience within the general pattern of the Joint Institute.

Professor Starr said, with American interests in mind: "In the matter of other disciplines such as History, Political Science, Geography, we should, in my estimation, stand to gain enormously from the study by teachers in formation of their discipline sur place. For example the post-war economic problems of the great northern plains from Pas de Calais across Belgium and into the Netherlands became central to the 'sociological' aspect of the culture studies we were making. The problem of the coal-iron-textile age as it faces current economic pressures and as it organizes itself to attract new industries and capitalize on its potential for a skilled labor force is but one of the kinds of seminar problems that could be instituted. Imagine too the study of post-war political issues from a location in Bonn or Berlin. I am more certain than ever, however, that American participation should rest upon a base of language skill. The old caution of the language teachers that not everyone speaks English is decidedly true. Many of the most brilliant or distinguished minds in the area in which we would be interested either do not speak English at all or if they are willing to carry on a conversation in the casual register do not have sufficient control to feel comfortable in expounding the subtleties of their subject in a formal presentation of complex ideas."*

In the type of Institute mentioned by Professor Starr, the American participants would be the major beneficiaries, though the program could doubtless be shaped to merit the interest and justify the participation of a certain number of fledgling European scholars and teachers. On the other hand, there are several areas of pedagogical innovation for which authoritative American informants would come as a precious boon to a growing number of teachers and educators in Europe. I listed some of these areas anticipatorily in the body of the report but they stand repeating: any seminars or Institutes on the "New Mathematics" or the "New Sciences," on programmed learning or audio-visual methodology that one might wish to transplant -- staff, participants, exhibits and all -- would find a ready welcome and a large number of aspiring participants almost anywhere in Western Europe; or again, not many of these latter would consider it a hardship if their attendance at a Joint Institute of this sort held in the United States could be facilitated.

Out of these final considerations emerge the rough outlines of a possible future pattern of educational collaboration between the Old World and the New: either centrally or in each interested country an office would be set up, sponsored by the educational authorities of the cooperating nations and charged with organizing or coordinating a broad gamut of cross-national programs of further training for linguistically qualified teachers in Europe and the United States. To try to operate such a system on a strict quid-pro-quo basis would be probably impossible and certainly contrary to the spirit that should animate such a venture. However, one would expect the coordinating agency to assure a nice equality in the burden shared and at least a rough distributive justice in the benefits received.

Such cooperative programs, based on a frank intellectual give-and-take among mature adults, pose no threat to national educational traditions, which must be able to stand up under inquiry and inspection if they are to remain viable. Rather, these programs would assist the rapid diffusion of teaching information and skills in a period of accelerating educational innovation and in this way would make their modest contribution to the triumph of civilized values.

*W. Starr et al. "The Joint European-United States Institutes for Advanced Study. Final Technical Report," n. d., p. 10.

APPENDIX

INTERNATIONALES SEMINAR UBER FREMDSPRACHENUNTERRICHT

1966

ADMINISTRATION AND STAFF

A. P. van TESLAAR	Sprachkybernetisches Forschungszentrum Friedrich Ebert Anlage Heidelberg
W. FREEMAN TWADDELL	Brown University Providence, Rhode Island
W. H. STARR	New York University New York, New York

LECTURERS

Linguistics

A. P. van TESLAAR W. FREEMAN TWADDELL DAVID J. ALLERTON	Department of General Linguistics University of Manchester Manchester, England

Psycholinguistics

KARL FRIEDRICH GRAUMANN	Director, Psychological Institute University of Heidelberg
DOCTOR SOLLE	Psychological Institute University of Heidelberg
PROFESSOR BREDENKAMP	Psychological Institute University of Heidelberg

Phonetics

HELMUT RICHTER	Phonetics Institute University of Cologne

Socio-Cultural Analysis and Contrastive Linguistics

ALBERT H. MARCKWARDT	Princeton University Princeton, New Jersey

Stylistics and Literary Analysis

THEODOR F. SCHNITZLER	Director, German Institute University of Heidelberg

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF 1966 CONPASS REPORTS

The following list constitutes the bibliography, to date, of reports on assessment of the 1966 NDEA Title XI and Arts and Humanities programs of the U.S. Office of Education by the Consortium of Professional Associations for the Study of Special Teacher Improvement Programs:

Axelrod, Joseph, FROM UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT TO PROFESSIONAL TEACHER, An Assessment of NDEA Institutes for Undergraduates Preparing to Become Elementary or Secondary Teachers of Modern Foreign Languages, 1967, 66 pp., Tables, Appendices.

Brown, Donald J. and James W. Brown, EFFECTS OF SPECIAL MEDIA INSTITUTE PROGRAMS UPON THE BEHAVIOR OF TITLE XI NDEA INSTITUTE DIRECTORS (English, History, Geography, Reading, Modern Foreign Languages, and School Library Personnel), Department of Audiovisual Instruction (National Education Association) for CONPASS, 1966, 72 pp., Tables, Appendix.

Gray, Donald J., REPORT ON THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES INSTITUTES OF 1966, 1966, 27 pp., Tables.

The above report was based in part on visitation reports by Grose Evans, Curator, Extension Services, National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.; John F. Latimer, Classics Department, George Washington University, Washington, D.C.; John F. Morrison, Dean, College of Fine Arts, Ohio University, Athens, Ohio; and Lee Rigsby, Director, School of Music, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Hackett, F.D., J.A. Schad, and R.E. Stake, REPORT ON THE SUMMER 1966 INDUSTRIAL ARTS INSTITUTES, 1966, 17 pp., Tables.

Hook, J.N., NDEA INSTITUTES FOR TRAINERS OF TEACHERS (SUMMER, 1966), 1966, 82 pp., Appendix, Tables.

Longaker, Richard, and Robert Cleary, REPORT ON EVALUATION OF PILOT CIVICS INSTITUTES, NDEA 1966, 1966, 7 pp.

Reese, Jim E. and Robert L. Darcy, REPORT ON THE 1966 NDEA ADVANCED STUDY INSTITUTES IN ECONOMICS, 1966, 25 pp., Tables, Appendix.

Shugrue, Michael F., Carl A. Barth, and Leo Ruth, AN EVALUATION OF THE USE OF ENGLISH INSTITUTE MATERIALS CENTER CURRICULUM MATERIALS IN NDEA SUMMER INSTITUTES IN ENGLISH, 1966, Tables, Appendices.

van Teslaar, A.P., REPORT ON THE JOINT EUROPEAN-UNITED STATES NDEA INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY, MANNHEIM-HEIDELBURG, 30 June-24 August 1966, 1967, 19 pp., Appendix.